2/8/83 S0465-1 A

Arizona Labor Market NEWSLETTER

Arizona Department of Economic Security

Vol. VII, No. 2
February 1983

Unemployment Rate
Seasonally Adjusted
December*

ARIZONA	10.5%
Maricopa Co.	8.4%
Pima Co.	10.1%
UNITED STATES	10.8%

Consumer Price Index

National-November
1967 - Base Year

Wage Earner/Clerical Worker -	293.2
% Chg. Yr. Ago	4.6
All Urban -	293.6
% Chg. Yr. Ago	4.6

Phoenix-3rd Qtr.
1977 - Base Year

All Urban -	170.6
% Chg. Yr. Ago	5.4

Producer Price Index

National-November*
1967 - Base Year

All Commodities -	300.4
% Chg. Yr. Ago	1.7
Finished Goods -	284.9
% Chg. Yr. Ago	3.7

* Preliminary

Wage Survey Released

Employers and employees are both interested in wages, whether they are associated with a large or small company. While large firms are commonly represented in wage surveys, smaller ones are often excluded. For the past several years, the Labor Market Information unit of the Arizona Department of Economic Security has taken on the task of surveying employers with fewer than 100 workers. The 1982 survey results are now available, and this article takes a look at their implications.

This year's Maricopa County Small Employer Wage Survey was conducted in August and focused on the wages of journeymen-level jobs for 135 occupations. There was a total of over 6,800 employers in 1982's universe, of which 3,350 were surveyed. The randomly selected firms in the survey contained over 73 percent of the universe's employment. Usable survey replies were received from 21.3 percent of the sample's concerns, 714 in number. These answers represent 10.4 percent of the employers and cover an estimated 26.2 percent of the employment. The survey results provide a good cross section of employment in Maricopa County. This follows the trend of the last several years indicating more reliability in the all-industry average wage rates.

The total nonagricultural wage and salary employment during 1982 in Maricopa County recorded its first downturn since the recession of 1975, when it dropped 3.7 percent.

(Continued on pg. 2)

Universe and Survey Respondents

	Universe Employment	Survey Respondents Number of Employers	Survey Respondents Employment	Respondents Employment as Percentage of Universe Employment
Mining	290	2	150	51.7
Construction	25,130	108	7,580	30.2
Manufacturing	26,450	111	8,325	31.5
Transportation, Communication & Public Utilities	8,150	25	1,875	23.0
Wholesale Trade	25,305	93	6,975	27.6
Retail Trade	48,165	138	10,350	21.5
Finance, Insurance and Real Estate	14,795	39	2,925	19.8
Services	54,300	198	14,850	27.3
TOTAL	202,585	714	53,030	26.2

The employment drop during 1982 was much smaller, falling only an estimated 0.3 percent or, about 7,000, while new entrants into the county's labor force totaled over 20,000. During the year, all industries recorded employment increases with the exception of the manufacturing and construction sectors. Feeling the downturn of the U.S. economy, tight monies, and consumer reluctance to buy, large employment decreases were felt in these two industries. In the previous two years, healthy wage and salary employment increases took place in all industrial groups in Maricopa County, with the exception of the construction industry. Total nonagricultural wage and salary employment in the county recorded percentage increases of 3.7 and 3.0 in 1980 and 1981.

The percentage changes in the weighted average wage rates in the tabulation below were calculated from the all-industry survey results for the same occupations in 1980, 1981, and 1982. The same job titles in different industries were used for determining changes in average wage levels. This method gives, with consideration for survey error, an indication of the average wage rates direction and magnitude. The larger the response of replying employers and the greater the number of people reported in an occupation, the more reliable are the wage levels reported. This and last year's survey results are reported. All are increases, except where noted.

Wages in 1982 were not keeping up with inflation. The industry-wide weighted average wage rate increase for the year was 4.3 percent, while the U.S. consumer price index rise was 5.8 percent. Businesses in the finance, insurance, and real estate industry recorded the largest rise in their weighted average wage level, 14.6 percent, with

Wage Changes, by Occupation and Industry

	1981-1982	1980-1981		1981-1982	1980-1981
Managerial	6.0%	20.9%	Construction	-4.3%	11.7%
Professional	-1.6	14.8	Manufacturing	6.9	11.0
Technical	6.0	13.8	T.C.P.U.	-0.2	21.4
Services	-2.3	9.7	Wholesale Trade	10.7	1.2
Maint. & Prod.	2.5	10.1	Retail Trade	2.4	14.3
Clerical	6.1	7.7	F.I.R.E.	14.6	3.7
ALL	4.3	12.0	Service	4.5	14.1

clerical occupations leading this increase. Among wholesale trade firms, the maintenance and production and clerical job classifications led their rise, recording an increase of 10.7 percent in 1982. The managerial group of occupations in the manufacturing industry led their increase of 6.9 percent. In services businesses, the professional category of job classifications dominated other changes, producing a 4.5 percent increase for 1982. Establishments in the retail trade industry, led by their managerial group of occupations, increased 2.4 percent for the year. In the remaining industries, construction recorded a 4.3 percent decline in 1982; and, transportation, communication, and public utilities a 0.2 percent decrease in their weighted average wage levels.

The categories of managerial, technical, and clerical occupations in Maricopa County recorded the largest increases in weighted average wage rate changes in 1982. These groups' wage rates increased 6.0 to 6.1 percent. Within the managerial group, the higher and more responsible job positions recorded the largest gains. The managerial positions of automotive service, parts department, credit, controller, branch, and wholesaler led these increases. The largest wage increases in technical occupations were in three medical field positions, radiologic technologist, physician assistant, and medical laboratory technician/technologist. The clerical occupations recording the largest increases in 1982 were those of stock/inventory clerk, medical secretary, personnel aide, EDP keypunch operator, MTST operator, and bookkeeper.

The maintenance and production group of occupations recorded a small increase of 2.5 percent between the two surveys. The job positions of this group, which were ones mainly employed in the manufacturing and service industries, showed the greatest weighted average wages paid increases. The ten largest increases for 1982 in this classification took place in the occupations of drill press operator, oiler, industrial truck (forklift) operator, photoengraver, groundskeeper, building maintenance repairer, automotive body repairer, car wash attendant, cabinetmaker, and machine shop supervisor. Most of the construction industry's occupations are in the maintenance and production category. This group's occupations showing a decline include plumber, sheet metal worker, carpenter, general laborer, roofer, bricklayer, bulldozer operator, plasterer, and electrician.

The professional occupational cluster showed a decrease of 1.6 percent in weighted average wage rates during 1982. The lower wage levels were found in those job classifications principally associated within the finance, insurance, and real estate and the construction industries. The occupations reporting declines were claim adjuster, purchasing officer, loan officer, claim examiner, architect, and civil engineer. Two occupations recording increases in their average wage levels were the job classifications of EDP systems analyst and registered nurse.

Services occupations, found totally in the retail and service industries, recorded an overall decline of 2.3 percent in their weighted average wage levels for the year. Lower wage rates in 1982 were found in the occupations of dining room attendant, bartender, counter attendant, short order cook, meat cutter, and baker. The three occupations with the largest average wage level increases in 1982 occurred in the positions of cook, housekeeping cleaner, and chef.

Copies of the 1982 results of the Maricopa County Small Employer Wage Survey can be obtained by writing to the address on the back of this publication.

- - - Glede Kohler

WHERE SNOWBIRDS ROOST

The Bureau of Census may call them "nonpermanent residents," but most of these people go by the name of winter visitor or "snowbird" in Arizona. For the first time ever, the Census Bureau has collected and published counts of nonpermanent residents by state and county in which they were staying at the time of the census.

As has been the practice since the first U.S. Census in 1790, each person counted in the 1980 census was attributed to the population of the state of their usual residence. Therefore if a person was staying in California on Census Day (April 1, 1980), but had his or her permanent home in Arizona, the person would be added to the Arizona population estimate, not California's. However, the Bureau has attempted to provide separate counts for nonpermanent residents for the 1980 Census in order to give a gauge of the impact of nonpermanent residents in individual states.

For the purpose of this study, only nonpermanent residents staying in housing units occupied entirely by persons with a usual home elsewhere were counted. Persons staying in the house of a permanent resident are not included, nor are persons staying in hotels, motels, or campgrounds. Even though April is not the peak month of residence of nonpermanent residents for most states, the data available does provide some interesting information.

Not surprisingly, Arizona has a large number of nonpermanent residents. In fact, the state ranks third highest in both number of nonpermanent households and persons. Together the three sunbelt states of Florida, California and Arizona account for 61 percent of the nonpermanent residents identified during the 1980 census. Florida, alone, accounted for 46 percent.

States with the Largest Number of Nonpermanent Residents: April 1, 1980

State Where Staying at time of Census	Numbers		Nonpermanent Residents per 1,000 permanent Residents
	Households	Persons	
United States	300,586	547,100	-
Florida	132,257	252,554	25.9
California	23,392	43,056	1.8
Arizona	21,286	39,170	14.4
Texas	13,235	24,765	1.7
New York	11,826	20,353	1.2
New Jersey	5,410	11,648	1.6
Colorado	7,174	8,069	2.8
Maryland	3,866	7,933	1.9
Pennsylvania	4,613	7,410	0.6
Virginia	3,894	6,552	1.2
Other States	73,633	125,590	1.0

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, 1980 Census Population Supplementary Report PC80-51-6.

Selected Characteristics of Nonpermanent Households: April 1, 1980

State Where Staying at time of Census	Median age	Average Size of Household	Percent one-person Household	Percentage all persons in household 65 years old & over
United States	60.2	1.82	41.6	26.3
Florida	65+	1.91	25.4	41.7
California	47.0	1.84	49.2	12.9
Arizona	65+	1.84	26.0	43.4
Texas	45.0	1.87	49.4	16.0
New York	40.9	1.72	59.5	8.5
New Jersey	47.2	2.15	36.8	10.5
Colorado	29.6	1.12	93.1	1.3
Maryland	32.8	2.05	50.8	5.9
Pennsylvania	33.5	1.61	66.5	6.9
Virginia	29.2	1.68	67.8	3.4

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, 1980 Census of Population Supplementary Report PC80-51-6.

While California topped Arizona in the number of nonpermanent residents, Arizona had a far larger ratio of nonpermanent residents per every 1,000 permanent residents in the state. Its ratio of 14.4 is beaten only by Florida's ratio of 25.9 nonpermanent residents for every 1,000 permanent, and shows how significant these two state's winter-visitor populations are.

A closer look at the top 10 states with nonpermanent residents further defines Arizona and Florida's "nonpermanents" as likely to be older couples seeking a warm climate for the winter. Both states have a median age of 65 years and older for their snowbirds, and two-thirds are households of more than one person.

Looking at the other states on the top 10 list suggests that some of the nonpermanent residents are maintaining a second home because of jobs associated with the federal government. Maryland and Virginia's close proximity to Washington D.C. would support their presence on the top 10 list, as would the large percentage of one-person households and low median age. The same two factors of low median age and size of households seem to hint that vacation homes for the winter ski season are being maintained in Colorado, and perhaps New York. Second homes needed for business reasons may account for some of the residences in New York and New Jersey; and seasonal farmworkers may contribute to the nonpermanent households in many of the southern states.

But clearly, Arizona's nonpermanent residents are elderly winter visitors. Few of the part-time residents are foreign, and the majority come from northern states. The top 10 states of usual residence for persons in Arizona nonpermanent households in 1980 were as follows: Minnesota, with 4,188 households, Michigan (3,550), Washington (2,017), Colorado (1,803), Wisconsin (1,762), California (1,697), Arizona (1,498), North

(Continued on pg 6)

State, County, and Incorporated Places with 500 or More Persons in Nonpermanent Households, April 1, 1980

	Total Households	Total Persons	Size of Household	Median Age
Arizona	21,287	39,170	1.84	65+
Maricopa County	8,648	16,032	1.85	65+
Mesa	2,511	4,646	1.85	NA
Phoenix	1,648	3,032	1.84	NA
Scottsdale	835	1,511	1.81	NA
Tempe	NA	574	NA	NA
Pima County	1,971	3,592	1.82	64.1
Tucson	1,145	2,068	1.81	NA
Pinal County	1,518	2,851	1.88	65+
Apache Junction	986	1,872	1.90	NA
Remaining Counties	9,150	16,695	1.82	NA

NA = Not Available

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, 1980 Census of Population Supplementary Report PC80-51-6.

Dakota (1,460), New York (1,356), and Ohio (1,333). Nationally those residents most likely to maintain a second household somewhere else lived in New York, Michigan, Ohio, California, Illinois, and Pennsylvania.

In Arizona, the major portion of nonpermanent households were located in three counties -- Maricopa, Pima and Pinal -- and Mesa had the largest number of nonpermanents of any Arizona city. In fact, Mesa has the third largest nonpermanent resident population of any incorporated community in the United States, topped only by St. Petersburg, Florida (with 5,503 nonpermanents) and Pompano Beach, Florida (4,756).

- - - Margaret Coulter

AMERICAN INDIANS IN ARIZONA

In 1980 there were 1,364,133 American Indians living in the United States, representing only 0.6 percent of the population as a whole. But in Arizona, Native Americans have always been a significant portion of the state's population. The 152,498 American Indians in the state represent 5.6 percent of Arizona's population and in Apache County they represent 74.9 percent. Only California and Oklahoma have larger American Indian populations, and even then they compose only 0.8 percent of California's population and an equivalent 5.6 percent of Oklahoma's.

About three-fourths (74.6 percent) of Arizona's Indians live on a reservation. The largest reservation in the state, both in size and population, is the Navajo Reservation which spreads through Apache, Coconino and Navajo counties, as well as into New Mexico and Utah. But two-thirds of the Navajo Reservation population resides in Arizona and 94.2 percent of the residents of the reservation are American Indians.

The reservation with the youngest median age, as well as the greatest number of persons per household was the Pascua Yaqui Reservation in Pima County. One-third of their population is between the ages of 5 and 17 years.

Two of Arizona's reservations have relatively few American Indians residing on them. The Colorado River Reservation, near Parker, has a mixture of Mohave, Navajo, Chemehuevi, and Hopi tribal members living there, but only 29.2 percent of the 6,640 reservation population are American Indians. The Fort Yuma Reservation in Yuma County has an even smaller percentage of Native American residents, with only 6.1 percent of the population being members of the Quechan Tribe. The reservation also has the smallest number of American Indians per household, and the oldest median age of any reservation. In fact, one-fifth of its American Indian population was 65 years old or over.

There are two reservations, Gila Bend and the Payson Community of Yavapai-Apache, that were uninhabited in 1980. The Yavapai Reservation, near Prescott, has the smallest population of any inhabited reservation. It also has the second-smallest person-per-household size, and 62 percent of its tribal members are over 16 years of age.

- - - Margaret Coulter

Characteristics of American Indians on Reservations, 1980

Reservation*	Total Population Regardless of Race	American Indians					
		Total	% of Total Population	Male	Female	Median Age	Persons Per Household
Camp Verde	200	173	86.5%	81	92	19.9	3.89
Cocopah	355	349	98.3	178	171	21.1	5.27
Colorado River	6,640	1,941	29.2	970	971	20.2	3.83
Fort Apache	7,774	6,880	88.5	3,405	3,475	19.1	4.72
Fort McDowell	349	345	98.9	189	156	24.2	4.15
Fort Mohave	183	127	69.4	59	68	18.5	3.91
Fort Yuma	2,235	137	6.1	69	68	34.3	2.71
Gila River	7,380	7,067	95.8	3,501	3,566	20.6	4.29
Havasupai	282	267	94.7	132	135	21.9	4.38
Hopi	6,906	6,601	95.6	3,224	3,377	21.7	4.50
Hualapai	849	809	95.3	410	399	20.8	5.11
Kaibab	173	93	53.8	41	52	23.8	3.72
Maricopa	297	375	94.5	190	185	20.8	5.54
Navajo	76,042	71,667	94.2	34,867	36,800	18.7	4.72
Papago	7,203	6,959	96.6	3,441	3,518	21.4	4.47
Pascua Yaqui	562	551	98.0	258	293	18.0	6.87
Salt River	4,089	2,624	64.2	1,278	1,346	19.8	4.56
San Carlos	6,104	5,872	96.2	2,875	2,997	19.5	4.78
San Xavier	875	851	97.3	408	443	21.8	4.57
Yavapai	76	66	86.8	28	38	21.5	3.25

*Includes only that portion of the reservation in Arizona.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, General Population Characteristics: Arizona, 1980 Census of Population PC80-1-B4.

December 1982 (in thousands)

	ARIZONA				
				-- Amt Change --	
	Dec.* 1982	Nov. 1982	Dec. 1981	Nov. to Dec.	1981 to 1982
TOTAL CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE	1340.4	1336.5	1295.3	+3.9	+45.1
Total Unemployment	135.5	133.8	82.9	+1.7	+52.6
Rate	10.1	10.0	6.4	---	---
Rate (Sea. Adj.)**	10.5	10.2	6.7	---	---
Total Employment	1204.9	1202.7	1212.4	+2.2	-7.5

THE ABOVE LABOR FORCE STATISTICS SHOULD

NONAGRICULTURAL WAGE AND SALARY EMPLOYMENT BY PLACE OF WORK

TOTAL WAGE AND SALARY	1043.4	1040.8	1060.4	+2.6	-17.0
Manufacturing	147.6	148.3	159.4	-0.7	-11.8
Durable Goods	114.6	115.2	124.7	-0.6	-10.1
Stone, Clay and Glass	4.7	4.8	5.3	-0.1	-0.6
Primary and Fabricated Metals	14.1	14.3	17.2	-0.2	-3.1
Primary Metals	6.8	6.9	9.2	-0.1	-2.4
Fabricated Metals	7.3	7.4	8.0	-0.1	-0.7
Machinery	59.7	59.8	63.0	-0.1	-3.3
Other Durable Goods	36.1	36.3	39.2	-0.2	-3.1
Aircraft and Missiles	16.8	16.7	18.1	+0.1	-1.3
Lumber and Wood Products (Except Furniture)	5.2	5.2	5.8	+0.0	-0.6
All Other Durable Goods	14.1	14.4	15.3	-0.3	-1.2
Nondurable Goods	33.0	33.1	34.7	-0.1	-1.7
Food and Kindred Products	8.5	8.6	8.9	-0.1	-0.4
Apparel	4.7	4.7	5.4	+0.0	-0.7
Printing and Publishing	11.5	11.6	11.3	-0.1	+0.2
All Other Nondurable Goods	8.3	8.2	9.1	+0.1	-0.8
Mining and Quarrying	15.5	15.7	24.8	-0.2	-9.3
Copper Mining	12.6	12.8	21.7	-0.2	-9.1
Other Mining and Quarrying	2.9	2.9	3.1	+0.0	-0.2
Construction	61.0	60.9	65.2	+0.1	-4.2
Trans., Communications, and Public Utilities	55.1	54.8	55.3	+0.3	-0.2
Transportation	23.0	22.8	24.0	+0.2	-1.0
Communications and Public Utilities	32.1	32.0	31.3	+0.1	+0.8
Trade	270.2	264.3	267.7	+5.9	+2.5
Wholesale Trade	53.9	53.1	54.0	+0.8	-0.1
Retail Trade	216.3	211.2	213.7	+5.1	+2.6
General Merchandise and Apparel	41.4	38.7	43.0	+2.7	-1.6
Food Stores	34.1	33.4	33.5	+0.7	+0.6
Automotive and Service Stations	24.4	24.4	24.7	+0.0	-0.3
Eating and Drinking Places	73.9	73.3	70.8	+0.6	+3.1
Other Retail Trade	42.5	41.4	41.7	+1.1	+0.8
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	61.8	61.8	62.4	+0.0	-0.6
Services and Miscellaneous	223.7	223.5	220.0	+0.2	+3.7
Hotels and Other Lodging Places	23.6	23.6	23.6	+0.0	+0.0
Business Services	38.8	39.1	38.4	-0.3	+0.4
Health Services	61.1	60.9	58.9	+0.2	+2.2
Other Services	100.2	99.9	99.1	+0.3	+1.1
Government	208.5	211.5	205.6	-3.0	+2.9
Federal	38.4	38.8	38.4	-0.4	+0.0
State and Local	170.1	172.7	167.2	-2.6	+2.9
School	105.1	106.7	101.7	-1.6	+3.4

* Preliminary
** Normal seasonal variations have been eliminated to reflect underlying economic trends.
NOTE--Data has been adjusted to the 1972 Standard Industrial Classifications (SIC).

December 1982 (in thousands)

MARICOPA COUNTY					PIMA COUNTY				
			-- Amt Change --					-- Amt Change --	
Dec.* 1982	Nov. 1982	Dec. 1981	Nov. to Dec.	1981 to 1982	Dec.* 1982	Nov. 1982	Dec. 1981	Nov. to Dec.	1981 to 1982
817.5	815.0	790.7	+2.5	+26.8	249.4	248.6	237.0	+0.8	+12.4
66.2	66.0	42.0	+0.2	+24.2	24.5	24.5	13.4	+0.0	+11.1
8.1	8.1	5.3	---	---	9.8	9.9	5.7	---	---
8.4	8.3	5.5	---	---	10.1	10.0	5.9	---	---
751.3	749.0	748.7	+2.3	+2.6	224.9	224.1	223.6	+0.8	+1.3

NOT BE USED FOR REVENUE SHARING PURPOSES.

NONAGRICULTURAL WAGE AND SALARY EMPLOYMENT BY PLACE OF WORK

663.5	660.7	670.8	+2.8	-7.3	194.1	193.2	193.6	+0.9	+0.5
106.6	107.3	115.6	-0.7	-9.0	25.4	25.0	25.0	+0.4	+0.4
84.8	85.6	92.9	-0.8	-8.1	20.4	20.1	20.0	+0.3	+0.4
2.9	2.9	3.3	+0.0	-0.4					
9.6	9.7	11.0	-0.1	-1.4					
47.3	47.8	51.2	-0.5	-3.9					
25.0	25.2	27.4	-0.2	-2.4					
21.8	21.7	22.7	+0.1	-0.9	5.0	4.9	5.0	+0.1	+0.0
5.7	5.7	6.1	+0.0	-0.4					
2.2	2.3	2.6	-0.1	-0.4					
8.4	8.4	8.2	+0.0	+0.2					
5.5	5.3	5.8	+0.2	-0.3					
0.5	0.5	0.4	+0.0	+0.1	3.8	3.8	7.5	+0.0	-3.7
41.2	40.9	45.1	+0.3	-3.9	11.7	11.7	11.2	+0.0	+0.5
34.2	34.0	34.1	+0.2	+0.1	8.8	8.8	9.0	+0.0	-0.2
15.0	14.9	15.5	+0.1	-0.5	3.5	3.5	3.7	+0.0	-0.2
19.2	19.1	18.6	+0.1	+0.6	5.3	5.3	5.3	+0.0	+0.0
180.9	176.4	179.0	+4.5	+1.9	44.9	44.1	44.7	+0.8	+0.2
42.3	41.9	42.8	+0.4	-0.5	5.7	5.7	6.1	+0.0	-0.4
138.6	134.5	136.2	+4.1	+2.4	39.2	38.4	38.6	+0.8	+0.6
26.1	24.3	27.3	+1.8	-1.2	8.2	7.8	8.4	+0.4	-0.2
22.2	21.5	21.5	+0.7	+0.7	5.3	5.3	5.3	+0.0	+0.0
14.7	14.8	14.8	-0.1	-0.1	4.2	4.2	4.4	+0.0	-0.2
47.0	46.3	44.3	+0.7	+2.7	13.0	12.9	12.8	+0.1	+0.2
28.6	27.6	28.3	+1.0	+0.3	8.5	8.2	7.7	+0.3	+0.8
47.5	47.5	48.3	+0.0	-0.8	9.2	9.2	8.9	+0.0	+0.3
148.4	148.2	145.0	+0.2	+3.4	43.1	43.1	42.4	+0.0	+0.7
14.9	14.6	14.3	+0.3	+0.6	2.5	2.5	2.8	+0.0	-0.3
31.2	31.4	30.9	-0.2	+0.3	6.2	6.3	6.1	-0.1	+0.1
41.2	41.1	39.5	+0.1	+1.7	12.9	12.8	12.5	+0.1	+0.4
61.1	61.1	60.3	+0.0	+0.8	21.5	21.5	21.0	+0.0	+0.5
104.2	105.9	103.3	-1.7	+0.9	47.2	47.5	44.9	-0.3	+2.3

-- Prepared by Labor Market Information, Research and Analysis (CPS-MOD, 1/82)

Nonmetropolitan Counties Labor Force and Employment — December 1982 (preliminary)

	Apache	Cochise	Coconino	Gila	Graham	Greenlee
TOTAL CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE*.	15,800	28,500	35,175	18,150	9,125	3,575
Total Unemployment	3,375	3,725	3,850	6,275	2,100	525
Rate	21.4%	13.1%	10.9%	34.6%	23.0%	14.7%
Rate (Seas. Adj.)**. . . .	21.4%	13.3%	10.9%	34.9%	24.5%	14.8%
Total Employment	12,425	24,775	31,325	11,875	7,025	3,050
THE ABOVE LABOR FORCE STATISTICS SHOULD NOT BE USED FOR REVENUE SHARING PURPOSES						
TOTAL WAGE AND SALARY . . .	13,150	20,500	30,025	9,775	4,425	3,000
Manufacturing	500	1,475	2,175	1,275	125	300
Mining and Quarrying	50	325	50	1,600	50	1,650
Construction	1,025	550	875	250	175	25
Trans., Comm., & Pub. Util..	1,700	1,550	2,175	325	150	75
Trade	1,075	4,000	7,450	1,850	1,425	250
Fin., Insur., & Real Estate.	125	550	750	225	125	50
Services and Miscellaneous .	3,650	2,325	6,875	1,725	650	125
Government	5,025	9,725	9,675	2,525	1,725	525

	Mohave	Navajo	Pinal	Santa Cruz	Yavapai	Yuma
TOTAL CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE*.	22,925	24,150	34,375	9,700	32,150	39,775
Total Unemployment	3,900	4,475	6,300	2,050	3,625	4,675
Rate	17.0%	18.5%	18.3%	21.1%	11.3%	11.8%
Rate (Seas. Adj.)**. . . .	17.1%	18.6%	19.2%	22.4%	11.0%	14.3%
Total Employment	19,025	19,675	28,075	7,650	28,525	35,100
THE ABOVE LABOR FORCE STATISTICS SHOULD NOT BE USED FOR REVENUE SHARING PURPOSES						
TOTAL WAGE AND SALARY . . .	14,825	15,650	24,175	7,775	17,525	25,225
Manufacturing	1,975	1,325	2,600	750	1,625	1,600
Mining and Quarrying	200	1,150	5,075	25	1,025	50
Construction	875	425	525	250	1,025	2,150
Trans., Comm., & Pub. Util..	850	1,650	1,075	525	875	1,075
Trade	4,700	3,200	3,800	3,475	4,425	8,725
Fin., Insur., & Real Estate.	675	325	525	250	725	825
Services and Miscellaneous .	2,600	3,425	2,025	975	3,375	4,475
Government	2,950	4,150	8,550	1,525	4,450	6,325

*Adjusted to the Current Population Survey (CPS) to reflect place of residence.
** Seasonal adjustment not applicable for revenue sharing purposes.

NOTE--Data have been adjusted to the 1972 Standard Industrial Classifications (SIC). Annual averages may not add due to rounding.

Arizona Labor Force and Employment for Revenue Sharing and Grant Applications

December 1982 (preliminary)

County	Civilian Labor Force	Employment	Unemployment	Rate
Statewide	1,351,304	1,210,288	141,016	10.4%
Apache	16,006	12,499	3,507	21.9
Cochise	28,771	24,884	3,887	13.5
Coconino	35,482	31,466	4,016	11.3
Gila	18,453	11,919	6,534	35.4
Graham	9,232	7,049	2,183	23.6
Greenlee	3,617	3,074	543	15.0
Maricopa	823,600	754,774	68,826	8.4
Mohave	23,167	19,121	4,046	17.5
Navajo	24,410	19,744	4,666	19.1
Pima	251,417	225,936	25,481	10.1
Pinal	34,768	28,224	6,544	18.8
Santa Cruz	9,829	7,695	2,134	21.7
Yavapai	32,420	28,648	3,772	11.6
Yuma	40,132	35,255	4,877	12.2

Data have been adjusted to the 1972 Standard Industrial Classification (SIC). These figures are the only official BLS labor statistics to be used for revenue sharing purposes. They are not designed to be used as economic indicators.

Estimated Hours and Earnings of Production Workers in Selected Industries in Arizona

INDUSTRY	AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS			AVERAGE WEEKLY HOURS			AVG. HOURLY EARNINGS		
	DEC.* 1982	NOV. 1982	DEC. 1981	DEC.* 1982	NOV. 1982	DEC. 1981	DEC.* 1982	NOV. 1982	DEC. 1981
FOR THE STATE OF ARIZONA*									
Manufacturing	360.26	339.00	349.00	40.8	39.1	40.3	8.83	8.67	8.66
Aircraft & Missiles	512.57	474.18	492.30	45.4	42.0	45.0	11.29	11.29	10.94
Food & Kindred Products	312.38	312.43	286.33	40.1	39.8	41.8	7.79	7.85	6.85
Primary Metals	458.63	453.66	475.26	38.9	37.9	40.9	11.79	11.97	11.62
Machinery	330.46	310.03	305.88	40.3	38.9	40.3	8.20	7.97	7.59
Copper Mining	531.45	513.52	510.86	40.6	39.2	41.0	13.09	13.10	12.46
Construction	448.23	452.36	476.19	34.4	34.4	36.8	13.03	13.15	12.94
Utilities	523.20	492.42	443.83	43.6	43.5	43.9	12.00	11.32	10.11
Retail Trade**	210.33	213.97	199.73	34.2	34.4	33.4	6.15	6.22	5.98
Wholesale Trade	323.98	323.98	321.10	38.8	38.8	40.8	8.35	8.35	7.87

* Preliminary

** Excludes eating and drinking places.

NOTE--These estimates are based on a sample of full and part-time production and related employees whose payroll and hours are reported for the pay period which includes the 12th of the month. All data has been adjusted to the 1972 Standard Industrial Classifications (SIC).

--Prepared by Labor Market Information, Research and Analysis (1972 SIC, 1/82)

THE ARIZONA LABOR FORCE IN DECEMBER 1982

December was another month of steady decline in Arizona's economy. The number of people unemployed has been rising steadily for nearly 18 months and with each passing month, new records are being established for the number of people unemployed. The state's basic industries of manufacturing, mining, and construction have all lost a significant number of jobs, and none of them seem poised for recovery. To underscore the seriousness of this recession, realize that 1982 represents only the second time that the total number of jobs in the state has declined.

Since August 1981, when manufacturing employment was at its peak level of 161,000, the number of jobs in this important industry have been declining. The 14,000 jobs that have been lost in this industry span the spectrum from heavy manufacturing and lumbering jobs, to the often mentioned high technology area of electronics and aerospace. Nearly every sector has been hit by job losses and no area of the state has been immune. Earlier, most of the layoffs were occurring in the nonmetropolitan areas and in Tucson. Now the Phoenix metropolitan area is experiencing a significant number of layoffs. And the short-term outlook remains unchanged, as a weak national economy forces employers to further reduce staffs. While the average number of hours worked did rise in December, this trend will not likely be sustained.

Recovery within the construction industry has apparently been short-lived. In October, after many months of declining employment, the industry reacted to falling interest rates and a surge in new home buyers by increasing staffs 1,200. Then in November, the trend continued but the increase in jobs was a more modest 500. Now in December, only 100 new jobs were added. Interest rates have recently been fairly stable, and it appears unlikely that mortgage rates will soon fall significantly. That, coupled with some leveling off in new home permits and serious consumer confidence problems, does not make 1983 appear to be a period of significant growth in the industry.

Little has changed in Arizona's copper mining industry recently. While the price of copper has moved up slowly, another 200 jobs were lost in December and an additional 500 layoffs have been announced. Some companies may expand employment in isolated instances, but recovery within the industry could easily be 6-9 months in the future.

In the trade and services industries, it appeared that Christmas activity was about at the level expected. Nationally, retail sales were down 0.4 percent over November while employment statewide increased only enough to satisfy average seasonal needs. As we move into the important winter tourism season, the situation looks good for this year. Many people have arrived to enjoy our beautiful weather and their purchases should help stabilize the economy.

- - - Dan Anderson

Arizona Unemployment Insurance Activities

	December 1982	November 1982	December 1981	% Change From 1 Year Ago
Arizona Claimants Served**	74,799	71,760	30,596	+144.5%
Arizona Weeks Unemployed***	INA	10.2	8.8	INA
Arizona Benefits Paid**	$ 26,071,264	$ 22,413,423	$ 9,696,670	+168.9%
Arizona Trust Fund Balance	$203,655,116	$220,292,918	$287,941,052	-292.7%

*Estimated **All Programs ***UI Only

GROWING PAINS

Updated estimates of the residential population of the United States have been released by the Census Bureau. They show a 15-month gain of 1.2 percent between April 1, 1980 and July 1, 1981. Almost all of the growth was in the South and West, with Nevada continuing to lead the way as the fastest-growing state.

Arizona dropped from fourth place to tie with Alaska for sixth place. Arizona's 2.8 percent growth rate is considerably below its annual average rate of 5.4 percent during the 1970's. It had been estimated that the growth rate would slow in the 1980's, but it had been anticipated by most economists to grow at a rate of around 3.3 or 3.4 percent. Evidently job insecurity and the slowdown in resale housing have kept most potential migrants close to home. Even Nevada's top spot in growth is well below the 1970's annual rate of 6.4 percent.

Resident Population (in 000's), July 1, 1981 and Percent Change from April 1, 1980

State	Pop. 7/1/81	% Chng.	State	Pop. 7/1/81	% Chng.
Alabama	3,917	0.7	Montana	793	0.7
Alaska	412	2.8	Nebraska	1,577	0.4
Arizona	2,794	2.8	Nevada	845	5.7
Arkansas	2,296	0.1	New Hampshire	936	1.6
California	24,196	2.2	New Jersey	7,404	0.5
Colorado	2,965	2.6	New Mexico	1,328	2.1
Connecticut	3,134	0.8	New York	17,602	0.3
Delaware	598	0.5	North Carolina	5,953	1.3
Florida	10,183	4.5	North Dakota	658	0.9
Georgia	5,574	2.0	Ohio	10,781	-0.2
Hawaii	981	1.6	Oklahoma	3,100	2.5
Idaho	959	1.6	Oregon	2,651	0.7
Illinois	11,462	0.4	Pennsylvania	11,871	-
Indiana	5,468	-0.4	Rhode Island	953	0.6
Iowa	2,899	-0.5	South Carolina	3,167	1.5
Kansas	2,383	0.8	South Dakota	686	-0.7
Kentucky	3,662	-	Tennessee	4,612	0.5
Louisiana	4,308	2.5	Texas	14,766	3.8
Maine	1,133	0.7	Utah	1,518	3.9
Maryland	4,263	1.1	Vermont	516	0.8
Massachusetts	5,773	0.6	Virginia	5,430	1.6
Michigan	9,204	-0.6	Washington	4,217	2.1
Minnesota	4,094	0.4	West Virginia	1,952	0.1
Mississippi	2,531	0.4	Wisconsin	4,742	0.8
Missouri	4,941	0.5	Wyoming	492	4.5
			U.S. TOTAL	229,307	1.2

- (less than 0.05 percent)

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Provisional Estimates of the Population of States: July 1, 1981, Series P-25, No. 911.

Construction - The Lohr Cos., a Los Angeles development company, recently announced plans for a second office complex in midtown-Phoenix that will bring to $46 million the value of the firm's development in the Valley. The new $23 million project will be located at Third Avenue and Clarendon, and will involve three buildings totaling 150,000 square feet.

Construction of a 28-story building will begin in May on the northeastern corner of Central and Van Buren in Phoenix. The building is expected to cost $40 million and will have 380,000 square feet of space and eight stories of parking.

A $17 million office complex, to be called Brookstone, is planned for Third Street and Monte Vista in Phoenix. Two identical buildings of 120,000 square feet will be built on the 6-acre site.

Continental Catering, a 16-year-old Phoenix firm, is building a $500,000 headquarters at 231 N. 32nd Place in Phoenix. The 6,500-square-foot building will be used for kitchen facilities, a florist shop, wine cellar, and storage.

Manufacturing - The Defense Department and other federal agencies awarded contracts worth $1.15 billion to firms in Maricopa County in 1982, according to the Defense Contract Administration. Last year, Arizona contracts totaled $969.5 million. In the Valley, Motorola Inc.'s Government Electronics Division in Scottsdale was the largest contractor, with 284 contracts, valued at $513 million.

Via West Inc., a computer components manufacturer, has moved its plant from Nogales, Son., to 534 N. Stone Ave. in Tucson. The company plans to expand its product line and is making the move to attract the engineers and draftsmen needed to develop new products. By the end of 1983 the company expects to have 30 to 40 workers, and plans to grow to about 80 by the end of 1984.

Intel-Tel Communications Inc. is changing its proposed Chandler site from Dobson and Fry to 6505 W. Williams Field Rd. Intel-Tel is a manufacturer and distributor of business-phone systems and presently operates at 3232 W. Virginia in Phoenix.

Mining - About 175 of Cities Service Co.'s 400 employees at the firm's mine and leaching operation near Globe will have their workweek reduced to three days beginning in mid-January. All employees have been on a four-day workweek since August 1981. About 600 employees were laid off by the mine last summer.

Another 50 employees were laid off in late December at the Pima Mine at Sahuarita by Cypress Pima Mining Company. The company had laid off 655 employees earlier which leaves only a custodial crew of 42 at the mine. Continued low prices for copper and molybdenum were cited as the reason for the layoff.

Cyprus Johnson Copper Co. laid off 14 of its 75 employees in January at its open-pit stripping operation 20 miles east of Benson. This is the first layoff by the company since the copper slump began a year ago. The company is owned by Cyprus Mines Corp., part of Standard Oil of Indiana.

Trade - Nearly 350 employees of Zody's Department Stores lost their jobs in mid-January when HRT Industries Inc. closed two stores in Phoenix and two in Tucson.

In early December, after being closed for six months, the Fed Mart store at 22nd Street and Kolb Road in Tucson reopened. The facility is leased by Fed Mart of Tucson, owned by Tom Riches of Phoenix, from financially troubled Fed Mart Corp. based in San Diego. Most of the workers are former Fed Mart employees. Another Fed Mart at Campbell and Fort Lowell roads in Tucson was reopened earlier by Riches under a similar arrangement.

Construction has begun on the Scottsdale Farmer's Market on three acres at Brown and Second Streets. It will include more than 2,000 square feet of fruit, vegetable, and specialty-item stands, eight to 10 ethnic restaurants, fresh-fish and meat markets, and several bakeries.

A Bashas' Market opened in January at Hancock Road and Lakeside Drive in Holiday Shores, near Bullhead City. More than 300 people applied for the 55 jobs available.

NEW LMI PUBLICATIONS

A new publication, Finding a New Job with Skills You Already Have, is now available. This publication is a do-it-yourself guide to analyzing your skills and using them to find a new job or start a new career. This practical handbook will help you learn the steps you can take to actively get the job you may have thought was unattainable.

Arizona Occupational Supply/Demand 1982 furnishes the first published results comparing indicators of occupational supply and demand. It should be of interest to education, and employment and training planners and administrators, as well as to students and career counselors.

One copy of each of the above LMI publications may be obtained by writing: Labor Market Information Publications - 733A, P.O. Box 6123, Phoenix, Arizona 85005. Multiple copies may be purchased for the cost of printing.

3/21/83 S0465-1 A

Arizona Labor Market NEWSLETTER

Arizona Department of Economic Security

Vol. VII No. 3
March 1983

Unemployment Rate
Seasonally Adjusted
January*

ARIZONA	10.6%
Maricopa Co.	8.5%
Pima Co.	10.8%
UNITED STATES	10.4%

Consumer Price Index

National-December
1967 - Base Year

Wage Earner/Clerical Worker -	292.0
% Chg. Yr. Ago	3.9
All Urban -	292.4
% Chg. Yr. Ago	3.9

Phoenix-4th Qtr.
1977 - Base Year

All Urban -	167.2
% Chg. Yr. Ago	1.0

Producer Price Index
National-December*
1967 - Base Year

All Commodities -	300.6
% Chg. Yr. Ago	1.6
Finished Goods -	285.1
% Chg. Yr. Ago	3.5

* Preliminary

Annual Arizona Forecasts

For the last three years, we have devoted this issue of the NEWSLETTER to the presentation of our semi-annual employment forecasts. Again this year we offer our view of the most likely course for Arizona's economy and its subareas. In 1982, while recovery was often anticipated, it stubbornly failed to arrive. The recovery that had been expected to arrive near the middle of the year, spurred on by tax cuts and increased social security benefits, fell under the weight of rising unemployment and declining production.

Are recent pronouncements of economic recovery also misstated, or is the much anticipated recovery beginning to arrive? And will it be a slow recovery, or has the magnitude of the recovery been understated and will Arizona enjoy a year of strong economic growth in 1983?

Remembering that it is very difficult to forecast, especially about the future, we make the following forecasts. They represent our best estimate of Arizona's coming economic fortunes. As always, we leave it to you to be the final judge.

****

The employment forecasting model featured in this month's Newsletter is primarily the achievement of Fred Ninotti, labor market analyst, and Dan Anderson, senior economist. Mr. Anderson also wrote the analysis that follows.

ARIZONA IN 1982

In 1982, the national recession finally arrived in Arizona. Employment growth in 1980 and 1981 had slowed from previous levels but, on net, new jobs were still being created. Such was not the case in 1982 as the unemployment rate rose from 6.1 percent in 1981 to 9.9 percent. Total wage and salary employment declined for only the second time as every major area of the state recorded job losses. Everyone is well aware of the serious condition the state's copper mining industry faces, but this alone does not account for the rise in unemployment. Manufacturing and construction industries also suffered employment losses while our remaining industries grew much slower than normal. National economic weakness continued to gain increasing influence over our economy and as we enter 1983, our unemployment rate is expected to remain high.

Hardest hit have been the state's nonmetropolitan areas. Every county in the balance of the state had double digit unemployment rates at the end of 1982. In many areas, the fact that nearly 40 percent of the state's copper mining industry is currently on layoff is sufficient to explain these high unemployment levels. But in many counties the effect of copper mining is quite minimal. In many of the state's northern counties, tourism and lumbering are very important. The national recession has cut into tourism activity as people cut their vacations short and stay closer to home. Also, the lack of building activity has reduced the demand for lumber and this, too, has reduced employment in many counties. In fact the industry is in such desperate shape, many saw mills have reduced their operations and nearly no new logging activity was performed in 1982. Instead, already cut logs were removed from the forests.

If the twin problems of copper and lumbering were not enough, Arizona's southern counties suffered from the devaluation of the peso. Much of their economic activity was closely tied to the economy of Mexico. When the peso was devalued to 1/7th of its previous value, communities such as Yuma, Nogales, Douglas, and Tucson saw much of their business disappear. Many businesses had just begun to recover from the previous devaluation, so the impact of another devaluation was quite discouraging to them. Although the value of the peso has now stabilized, the exchange rate of pesos for dollars will encourage consumers to spend their money in Mexico. This will slow recovery in Arizona.

In Maricopa County, total wage and salary employment declined only 0.2 percent. Because copper mining is not an integral part of the local economy, most of the jobs were lost in manufacturing and construction. A total of 11,500 jobs in these two industries were lost as semiconductor and aerospace manufacturers reacted to a reduced demand for their products by trimming staffs wherever possible. While this is a serious situation, it reflects only about a third of the loss recorded in the 1974-1975 recession. Instead of cutting staff, many companies seem to prefer reducing wages and workweeks. This helps them to maintain a trained work force that is available to produce products when the economy recovers.

In the construction industry, employment losses have been recorded now for three years. High interest rates and a slowly growing population have helped to keep employment down. Near the end of 1982, interest rates did begin to fall and employment within the industry began to rise. But continued improvement in the industry will require that interest rates continue to fall and that increased employment opportunities in Arizona attract a growing population.

Pima County suffered from losses in the copper mining industry during 1982, but benefited from defense purchases that helped to keep the manufacturing industry growing.

While some local manufacturing companies were forced to reduce staffs, other businesses found their need for employees rising. This produced a net increase in manufacturing jobs of 1,300. Meanwhile the same problems that plagued the copper mining and construction industries in other parts of Arizona had their impact on Pima

Annual Average Percent Change for Arizona Wage and Salary Employment (1972-1982)

	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
Wage & Salary	10.6	4.4	-2.3	4.1	6.7	10.6	9.4	3.5	2.7	-1.1
Manufacturing	11.7	2.5	-11.6	5.8	7.9	11.4	13.6	7.1	4.2	-4.4
Mining	10.3	9.3	-8.6	-2.4	-10.4	-9.8	12.4	-3.7	19.0	-26.4
Construction	14.3	-11.2	-24.9	-5.3	25.8	36.0	21.8	-11.6	-6.0	-11.0
T.C.P.U.	13.5	8.4	-3.2	1.8	5.1	7.5	9.4	5.1	6.0	3.9
Trade	11.1	5.1	0.1	4.6	6.9	9.6	8.4	4.1	4.2	0.4
F.I.R.E.	11.3	2.9	-0.7	1.2	6.8	10.1	10.8	4.7	4.5	1.5
Services	11.5	6.3	4.5	7.4	8.2	10.8	11.8	7.3	3.7	2.7
Government	6.0	9.1	5.4	4.5	2.6	7.1	0.7	2.9	- 1.1	0.2

Annual Average Percent Change for Maricopa County (1972-1982)

	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
Wage & Salary	11.9	3.8	-3.7	4.9	8.7	13.3	10.4	3.7	3.0	-0.2
Manufacturing	11.3	1.8	-14.2	5.8	8.8	13.2	13.3	6.9	2.5	-4.8
Mining	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-50.0	50.0	33.3	0.0	25.0
Construction	15.5	-12.6	-27.0	-1.6	31.4	44.3	24.7	-10.4	-2.6	-12.0
T.C.P.U.	17.0	9.5	-4.1	2.6	5.5	5.0	10.2	5.1	9.1	6.0
Trade	12.4	5.9	-1.1	5.2	8.5	11.1	8.8	4.1	4.3	0.4
F.I.R.E.	12.0	4.2	0.9	1.5	6.7	10.3	11.1	4.7	5.1	1.9
Services	13.9	5.6	2.6	7.0	10.0	14.5	12.4	7.4	5.3	4.3
Government	6.8	7.6	5.8	5.6	3.1	9.0	0.8	2.1	-1.3	0.7

Annual Average Percent Change for Pima County (1972-1982)

	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
Wage & Salary	8.8	4.4	-0.1	2.3	3.3	6.2	9.2	4.6	3.1	-0.2
Manufacturing	15.2	3.3	-3.2	3.3	6.4	11.3	23.0	17.0	13.6	5.4
Mining	12.9	7.6	-5.9	-5.0	-7.9	-17.1	15.5	0.0	16.4	-39.7
Construction	7.9	-13.1	-21.0	-4.3	12.2	25.7	26.0	-9.4	-9.7	-10.0
T.C.P.U.	10.1	7.9	-6.1	0.0	1.3	3.8	7.4	3.4	0.0	0.0
Trade	7.4	2.3	3.5	4.1	3.0	7.0	6.8	3.8	4.2	1.6
F.I.R.E.	10.3	1.6	-4.6	-3.2	8.3	9.2	12.7	6.2	0.0	1.2
Services	10.7	8.0	4.1	5.0	4.1	10.8	8.6	7.6	4.3	4.4
Government	4.8	10.6	4.9	2.7	2.2	-0.2	0.9	3.3	-0.7	0.5